

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS FO Box 1430 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.tepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/611,455	06/30/2003	James Harold Gray	36968/332546	1612	
JOHN S. PRA	7590 06/26/200 TT	EXAMINER			
KILPATRICK	STOCKTON LLP 369	INGVOLDSTAD, BENNETT			
1100 PEACH SUITE 2800	FREE STREET	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
ATLANTA, C	GA 30309	2623			
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			06/26/2008	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Ī	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/611,455	GRAY ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	BENNETT INGVOLDSTAD	2623	

	BENNETT INGVOLDSTAD	2623						
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress					
THE REPLY FILED 17 June 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.								
<ol> <li>X The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of App for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 (applications).</li> </ol>	Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request						
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	date of the final rejection.							
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or	The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the satuatory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either tox (a) or (b), ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FIRNAL REJECTION. See MPEP 765.07(f).							
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension is under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action, or (2) set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filler may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704 in the contract of the final contract of the final rejection of the final rejection.								
NOTICE OF APPEAL  2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compfiling the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extended to the Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with the Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with the Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with the Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with the Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with the Notice of Appeal has been filed with the Notice of A	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the						
AMENDMENTS								
The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,  (a) They raise new issues that would require further co  (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belc)  (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bel	nsideration and/or search (see NOTow);	E below);						
appeal; and/or  (d) They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.						
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).								
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1.		mpliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).					
<ul> <li>5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):</li> <li>6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment cancelling non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ul>								
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will vided below or appended.	be entered and an e	xplanation of					
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected:								
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:								
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE								
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>	d sufficient reasons why the affidavi	t or other evidence is	necessary and					
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar.</li> </ol>	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a					
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.					
<ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered but <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u></li> </ol>	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:					
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).  13. Other:	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).							
/Scott Beliveau/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2623								

## Continuation Sheet

In traversing the rejections, Applicant asks with respect to the rejection of claim 1: "how did the hot key signal get from the sel-top box (that performed the email query) to the interactive television service provider?" In reading claim 1, there is no indication that a hot key signal is transmitted from a user's STB to a service provider. Nor is the claim being construed in such a way for the rejection. The claim requires that the hot key signal is 'transmitted to the user from an interactive television service provider via a network'. This limitation is disclosed by Nakano as citied. The application may also notify the SET Top Box user via an icon on the TD screen" [para 0019]. The application may be resident on a service provider server [para 0019]. Therefore the hot key signal is transmitted from a service provider server to a user STB, and Nakano meets the limitation as cited.

Applicant further asks: "Also, why would the set-top box send information on the availability of email, back to the interactive television service provider could send this back to the set-top box along with the content signal in parts (3) and (4)?" Again, there is no indication, either in the claim or in the rejection, that a hot key signal is being sent from the set top box to the service provider.

Therefore the examiner upholds the previous rejections.